



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,185	07/30/2001	Alan Tsu-I Yaung	STL920000090US1	2703
47069	7590	06/23/2006	EXAMINER	
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP ATTN: IBM54 315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212			VO, LILIAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/918,185

Applicant(s)

YAUNG, ALAN TSU-I

Examiner

Lilian Vo

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/27/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 48 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 – 10, 13, 15, 17 – 26, 29, 31, 33 – 42, 45 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Putzolu et al. (US 6,681,243, hereinafter Putzolu) in view of Flores et al. (US 5,630,069, hereinafter Flores).

4. Regarding **claim 1**, Putzolu discloses a method for enabling access to a plurality of service engines, wherein each service engine enables access to service resources (abstract, col. 7, line 60 – col. 8, line 12), comprising:

each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class (abstract, col. 7, line 41 – col. 8, line 10);

instantiating a service object for one service engine in response to at least one called method from one of the service class implementations, wherein the service object includes information on the service engine (col. 7, lines 41 – lines 59, col. 14, lines 42 – 67, fig. 7);

using the service object to access the requested information to return to the method call (col. 14, lines 42 - 67).

Putzolu however did not clearly disclose the step of providing a plurality of service class implementations for service engines from different vendors, and receiving method calls requesting information on service engine resources for one named service. Nevertheless, Flores discloses these features in fig. 4; col. 5, lines 55 – 59; col. 6, lines 62 – 64; col. 14, lines 42 – 67; col. 15, lines 1- 67; and col. 16, lines 16 - 19. It would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teaching of Flores with Putzolu because it would improve the integrity of Putzolu's system by providing to consultants, business process analysts, and application developers with a unified tool with which to conduct business process analysis, design, and documentation (Flores: col. 1, lines 7 – 10).

5. Regarding **claim 2**, Flores discloses the method calls are received from at least one application program including methods from at least one of the service class implementations to access information on at least one service from the service objects (col. 5, lines 55 – 59; col. 6, lines 62 – 64; col. 14, lines 42 – 67; col. 15, lines 1- 67).

6. Regarding **claim 3**, Flores discloses the services include workflow products from different vendors (col. 5, lines 54 – 59, col. 6, lines 121 – 24, 62 – 67, col. 16, line 1 – col. 17, line 67; col. 18, lines 1 - 67).

7. Regarding **claim 4**, Flores discloses the workflow service class implementations from different vendors each includes methods and objects from a same abstract workflow service class specifying methods and objects to include in all workflow service class implementations (col. 15, lines 58 – 63, col. 19 lines 51 – 67; col. 20, lines 1 - 67).

8. Regarding **claim 5**, Flores discloses the abstract workflow service class specifies a method to determine a data store used by resources in the service, wherein the workflow service class implementations for the workflow services implement a method to determine from the service object for the service the data store used by the service (col. 26, lines 19 - 67).

9. Regarding **claim 6**, Putzolu discloses the abstract workflow service class specifies methods to access information on workflows, workflow templates, and worklists (col. 7, lines 41 - 60).

10. Regarding **claim 7**, Putzolu discloses wherein the abstract workflow class specifies a method for a user to connect to the workflow service by passing user information that is used to authenticate the user to access the workflow service, and wherein the workflow service class implementations include methods to enable a connection between a user and one workflow service (col. 7, lines 41 – 60, col. 15, lines 50 – 67, col. 16, lines 17 – 37).

11. Regarding **claim 8**, Putzolu discloses the step of receiving a method call for the user to connect specifying a user name, authentication information, and one service; instantiating a

connection object if authentication passed including information on the specified user name, authentication information, and the service engine that can be accessed with the authentication; and returning a handle to the connection object for use in obtaining authentication information to access the service engine specified in the connection object (col. 16, lines 17 – 44, fig. 8).

12. Regarding **claim 9**, Putzolu discloses the connection object is stored in one service object (col. 17, lines 6 - 21).

13. Regarding **claim 10**, Putzolu discloses the steps of receiving one handle to one connection object; and returning the authentication information from the connection object for use in accessing the service resources (col. 16, lines 17 – 44 and fig. 8).

14. Regarding **claim 13**, Flores discloses the information on the service engine is maintained in the service object and wherein using the service object to access the requested information further comprises: if the method call requests information in the service object, returning the requested information from the service object (fig. 4).

15. Regarding **claim 15**, Putzolu discloses the steps of: accessing authentication from the service object; providing the accessed authentication information to the service engine; using, with the service engine, the accessed authentication information to authenticate access, wherein the service engine executes the method to access the requested information if access is authenticated (col. 16, lines 17 – 44 and col. 17, lines 6 – 21 and fig. 8).

16. **Claims 17 – 26, 29, 31, 33 – 42, 45 and 47** are rejected on the same ground as stated in claims 1 – 10, 13 and 15 above.

17. Claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 27, 28, 30, 32, 43, 44, 46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Putzolu et al. (US 6,681,243) in view of Flores et al. (US 5,630,069) as applied to claims 1, 17 and 33 above, and further in view of Wollrath et al. (US 6,487,607, hereinafter Wollrath).

18. Regarding **claim 11**, Putzolu and Flores did not clearly disclose the additional limitation as claimed. Nevertheless, Wollrath discloses wherein the service class implementations for the services include both a client side service class and server side service class, wherein the client side service class includes methods and objects used to access information on resources available at one service engine, and wherein the server side service class includes methods and objects to access information on resources available at one service engine, wherein the client side service class methods are invoked on a client system and the service side service class methods are invoked on a server including the service engine (fig. 6, col. 9, lines 50 – 67, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 27 – 65). It would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate Wollrath's teaching with the combination of Putzolu and Flores to provide an advantage of not being type-specific so that it may invoke methods of varying types of remote objects (Wollrath: col. 9, lines 60 – 63).

19. Regarding **claim 12**, Wollrath discloses a call to one method in the client side service class implementation on the client transfers the called method to the server, wherein the called method is executed on the server (col. 4, lines 27 – 44).
20. Regarding **claim 14**, Wollrath discloses if the method call requests information not included in the service object, executing the method to access the requested information from the service engine (fig. 6, col. 9, lines 50 – 67).
21. Regarding **claim 16**, Wollrath discloses the step of accessing the requested information from the service engine further comprises: translating the method to native code capable of being executed by the service engine (abstract, col. 4, lines 39 – 44, col. 9, lines 50 – 67).
22. **Claims 27, 28, 30, 32, 43, 44, 46 and 48** are rejected on the same ground as stated in claims 11, 12, 14 and 16 above.

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments filed 4/5/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth below.
24. Regarding applicant's argument that Flores does not teach or suggest "providing service class implementations of a same abstract service class from different vendors as claimed", the examiner disagrees. Flores suggests providing service class implementations of a same abstract

Art Unit: 2195

service class from different vendors in col. 14, lines 51 – 67 and col. 16, lines 16 – 19, in which “the Model classes describe the business process and its components in terms of a hierarchy of classes... A class designated as the ActWfModel class owns and manages all the model classes (Object Model) such as business processes, workflow etc...” Furthermore, as disclosed in col. 5, lines 55 – 59, business process is “a network of workflows linked together that represent the recurrent process by which an organization performs and completes work, delivers products and services and satisfies customers”.

25. Regarding applicant’s argument that Putzolu does not teach or suggest “providing service class implementations of a same abstract service class from different vendors as claimed”, the examiner disagrees. First, as stated above, Flores discloses and/or suggests such teaching. Second, Putzolu was cited for disclosing and/or suggest each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class (col. 7, line 41 – col. 8, line 10). Col. 7, lines 61 – 66 in which “each resource on network 4 accessible by agents is accessible via a type of service...different disk services on different devices interface with the various types of disk drives and present a unified interface to agents... Each type of service provides a standardized interface to agents and the ability to access a certain resource... While the actual service class used by an agent to access a service type on each device may be different, an agent using a certain service type across different devices is still considered to be accessing the same service...”

26. Regarding applicant's argument that Flores does not teach or suggest the "service engines including workflow products from different vendors", the examiner disagrees. Flores suggests the service engine including workflow products from different vendors in col. 14, lines 51 – 67 and col. 16, lines 16 – 19, in which "the Model classes describe the business process and its components in terms of a hierarchy of classes... A class designated as the ActWfModel class owns and manages all the model classes (Object Model) such as business processes, workflow etc..." Furthermore, as disclosed in col. 5, lines 55 – 59, business process is "a network of workflows linked together that represent the recurrent process by which an organization performs and completes work, delivers products and services and satisfies customers".

27. Regarding applicant's argument that Flores does not teach and/or suggest the "workflow service class implementations from different vendors including methods and objects from the same abstract workflow service class specifying methods and objects to include in all workflow service class implementations", the examiner disagrees. As stated above that Flores discloses workflow service class implementations from different vendors. Flores discloses that the "model also utilized a set of workflow rules..." Therefore, it is inherent that each service class includes methods and objects from a parent class (abstract class) specifying methods and objects to include in all workflow service class in order for a network of workflows to function properly as they linked together.

Conclusion

28. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lilian Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-3774. The examiner can normally be reached on Thursday 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist at 571-272-2100.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2195

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lilian Vo
Examiner
Art Unit 2195

lv
June 3, 2006



MENG-AL LIAO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2195